

I. Introduction

In the Office Action dated May 6, 2004 and the Final Office Action dated Dec. 2, 2004, each of the independent claims (Claims 1, 5, and 9) were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claim 1 was rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,236,716 ("Marcus") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,953,401 ("Caveney"). Claims 5 and 9 were rejected as being unpatentable over Marcus in view of Caveney and U.S. Pat. No. 5,668,862 ("Bannister"). While Applicants do not agree with the Examiner's interpretation of Marcus, Caveney, and Bannister, Applicants have amended the independent claims to expedite prosecution of the current application.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections because the proposed combinations do not teach **a switch located within a public switched telephone network** that receives **from a caller** a selection of a destination option and the proposed combinations do not teach using a **service control point coupled with the switch** to route a telephone call to a telephone number corresponding to the destination option, as recited in each of the amended independent claims.

II. The Proposed Combinations Do Not Render the Independent Claims Unpatentable

Each of the independent claims is directed to providing a family telecommunications service that facilitates access to a family residence and locations of family members other than the family residence. Claims 1, 5, and 9 all recite **a switch located within a public switched telephone network** that receives from a caller a selection of a destination option and a **service control point coupled with the switch** to route a telephone call to a telephone number corresponding to the destination option. As explained in detail in the Office Action Response dated Aug. 6, 2004, both Marcus and Caveney teach telecommunications systems that are limited to routing calls within an **internal telecommunications system**.

As admitted by the Examiner, Marcus teaches a system within a PBX coupled to a public switched telephone network. Like Markus, Caveney also teaches a system within a PBX coupled to a public switched telephone network. (Col. 1, line 66 – Col. 2,

line 2). Thus, any combination of Marcus and Caveney necessary does not teach a switch located within a public switched telephone network that receives a selection of destination options or a service control point coupled with the switch that routes a telephone call to a telephone number corresponding to a destination option. The proposed combination of Marcus and Caveney does not render Claim 1, or any of the independent claims, unpatentable. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection to Claim 1 and any of its dependant claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

III. The Addition of Bannister to the Proposed Combination Does Not Render the Independent Claims Unpatentable.

Independent Claims 5 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcus in view of Caveney and Bannister. As stated above, Claims 1, 5, and 9 all recite **a switch located within a public switched telephone network** that receives **from a caller** a selection of a destination option. In contrast, Bannister discloses a method for an intended recipient of a telephone call to screen incoming calls based on the role of the telephone number dialed by a caller. As explained in detail in the Office Action Response dated Aug. 6, 2004, Bannister provides for an **intended recipient** to route the telephone call, not **the caller**. Thus, any combination of Marcus, Caveney, and Bannister does not teach the currently claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection to Claims 5 and 9, and any of their dependant claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

IV. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is therefore respectfully requested. If there are any questions concerning this Response, the Examiner is asked to phone the undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4200.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "S W Brim", written over a horizontal line.

Scott W. Brim
Registration No. 51,500
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200